

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 1st June, 1987

No. 9/3/87-6Lab/3035.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s The Gurgaon Distt. Coop. Milk Products Union Ltd., Gurgaon.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI A. S. CHALIA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 115 of 1983

between

SHRI HANS RAJ, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S
THE GURGAON DISTT. COOP. MILK PRODUCTS UNION LTD., GURGAON

Present :

Shri S. K. Goswami, for the workman.

Shri M. P. Gupta, for the respondent-management.

. AWARD

This reference under section 10(1)(c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. 14 of 1947), as amended from time to time and latest by Act No. 49 of 1984 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) was made to this Court by the State of Haryana (Department of Labour),—*vide* its endorsement No. ID/FD/GGN/26/83/13114—19, dated 18th March, 1983, to adjudicate upon the dispute of service matter covered by Second Schedule under section 7 of the said Act, arisen between Shri Hans Raj, workman and the respondent-management of M/s The Gurgaon Distt. Coop. Milk Products Union Ltd., Gurgaon. Accordingly, it has been registered as reference No. 115 of 1983.

2. Hans Raj, was appointed by the respondent on 6th July, 1974 as a supervisor. It has been claimed by him that as a matter of fact he used to do the duties of a Clerical nature. His services were terminated on 9th August, 1982. The allegations are that the said order was passed wrongly, illegally, malafidely and in violation of principle of natural justice. Further according to him no chargesheet was served upon him and no enquiry was ever held against him. It has also been alleged that no show cause notice was served upon him and moreover no personal hearing was granted to him. It has been alleged that he had not received letters dated 3rd May, 1982 and 25th June, 1982. Accordingly, request has been made by him to reinstate him into his job with continuity of service and further with full back wages.

3. On notice, respondent has contested the said reference. It has been denied that he was doing clerical job, and as a matter of fact he was holding supervisory post. It is alleged that he had been absenting from duty w. e. f. 1st October, 1981 and he did not turn up despite of letter, dated 3rd May, 1982 and 28th June, 1982 and as such his services were terminated,—*vide* letter dated 9th August, 1982 since he had remained absent for a long period. It was claimed that this letter of termination was duly delivered to him and now he has hardly any cause for any relief, by way of rejoinder the claim as well as allegations have been repeated by him.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor had framed the following issue on 3rd May, 1984: —

(i) As per reference ?

In support of order of termination there is statement of Shri Suresh Yadav, Senior Supervisor. On the other hand there are statements of Shri Hans Raj, workman and Satya Bir, employee of the Society. I have heard the parties as represented above, My finding on the said issue is as below: —

Issue No. 1 :

5. It is a easy case for the respondent to succeed. It was alleged,—*vide* its written statement that Hans Raj, has been absent from duty w. e. f. 1st October, 1981, and ultimately his services had

to be terminated on 9th August, 1982. It is according to para No. 2 of merits of the said written statement. It has not been replied by Shri Hans Raj, in the replication. He has simply stated that Para No. 2 of the written statement is wrong and not admitted as correct. In the evidence it has been stated by Shri Suresh Yadav, that he had been absented from duty and letter Ex. M-1 dated 3rd May, 1982 and M-4 dated 25th June, 1982 were sent to him under UPC,—vide Ex. M-2 and M-5 respectively. Hans Raj, has admitted on oath as WW-1 that he had remained absent from 1st October, 1981 to 9th August, 1982 and due to that he could not get his pay not once but he has repeated twice. Now no other proof is needed to prove his length of absence of about one year without any application. It is the height of the matter and he can hardly be helped in the matter.

6. The said matter is to be taken from another angle also. Respondent has led the evidence that letter Ex. M-1 and M-4 were sent to him under UPC,—vide receipt Ex. M-2 and M-5 respectively. It has been denied by him that he had received the same. It has also been stated on behalf of the respondent that,—vide Ex. M-3 his services were terminated on 27th July, 1982 and letter Ex. M-6 dated 9th August, 1982 was sent to him,—vide a registered letter and it was delivered to him,—vide Ex. M-7 Again it has been admitted as correct on oath by Hans Raj, that he has received this letter dated 9th August, 1982.

7. Notwithstanding the above, his representative has tried his best to assail the termination letter on technical grounds and in my opinion there is hardly any force in his contentions. He has tried to get support from WW-2, who has stated that in the service book there is no entry about the period of absence. It is little value since Hans Raj, has admitted on oath that he had remained absent from duty w. c. f. 1st October, 1982 till the end. If an employee chooses to remain absent from duty about one year without any intimation then how he can claim that post without any valid ground.

8. On the face of it the order of termination is not only reasonable but fits in the compelling circumstances of the case. Any how the functioning of the society had to be run and no employer would wait for one year for his employee to return on duty as and when he likes to choose. The said reference is accordingly answered against Hans Raj, and in favour of respondent.

A. S. CHALIA,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Faridabad.

Dated the 23rd April, 1987.

Endorsement No. 789, dated the 23rd April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

A. S. CHALIA,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Faridabad.

The 22nd June, 1987

No. 9/4/87-6Lab./3039.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Hindustan Waste Processing Factory Company Pvt., Yamuna Nagar :—

BEFORE SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Complaint No. 9/1984

between

MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HINDUSTAN WASTE PROCESSING FACTORY COMPANY
PVT. YAMUNANAGAR AND ITS WORKMEN THROUGH GENERAL SECRETARY,
PUNJAB BUSINESS AND SUPPLY MAZDOOR SANGH, YAMUNANAGAR

Present :

Shri Indersain Bansal, A. R. for the workman.

Shri K. D. Sehgal, General Manager for the management,

AWARD

This is a complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 moved by Shri Indersain Bansal General Secretary, Punjab Business and Supply Mazdoor Sangh, Yamunanagar.

2. The facts giving rise to the present complaint are noticed thus :—

The Punjab Business and Supply Mazdoor Sangh Registered Yamunanagar on behalf of the workmen gave a charter of general demands against the respondent. On failure of conciliation proceedings, the industrial dispute was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication by the State Government under Section 10(1)(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The said reference was registered as reference No. 169/1984. Shri Indersain Bansal, General Secretary of the workmen's Union has alleged that during the pendency of said reference, the Management has indulged in unfair labour practice *inter alia* on the following ground :—

- (1) The Management has suspended four workers and later on reinstated them after obtaining signatures on a fictitious agreement.
- (2) The Management suspended Balu Ram Workman.
- (3) The Management gave 5% special Inam to the workers who took their line and signed on fictitious agreement whereas the Management has refused to give similar benefit to other workers.
- (4) The Management has suspended 7 workmen on 8th September, 1984 and took back 4/5 workmen on duty on 25th September, 1984. Hence the complaint was filed.

3. The allegations made by the complainant were controverted by the respondent Management. It was pleaded that the present complaint is not maintainable because such application has to be made by individual workman concerning his rights and not by the Union.

4. The issues were settled and parties led evidence. Later on the Complainant Shri Indersain Bansal General Secretary of Punjab Business and Supply Mazdoor Sangh has made a statement to withdraw the complaint.

5. In view of the statement of Indersain Bansal Complainant, the present complaint is dismissed as withdrawn. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 6th April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 473, dated 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

[No. 9/4/87-6Lab./3042.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Captain M.S. Chini Contractor, C/o M/s. Oriental Staff College Sector No. 11, Bata Morah, Faridabad (ii) Managing Director Oriental Staff College, Sector 11, Bata Morah, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 188/1986

between

SHRI TEJ PAL, WORKMEN S/O SHRI KISHAN LAL, C/O KAMGAR UNION, 2/7, GOPY COLONY, OLD FARIDABAD AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S CAPTAIN M.S. CHINI, CONTRACTOR, C/O M/S ORIENTAL STAFF COLLEGE, SECTOR NO. 11, BATA MORAH, FARIDABAD (ii) MANAGING DIRECTOR, ORIENTAL STAFF COLLEGE, SECTOR 11, BATA MORAH, FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Shri Tej Pal workman in person.

Shri M.S. Chini, Contractor in person.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Tej Pal, workman and the Management of M/s Captain M.S. Chini Contractor, C/o M/s Oriental Staff College, Sector No. 11, Bata Morah, Faridabad (ii) M/s Managing Director, Oriental Staff College, Sector 11, Bata Morah, Faridabad to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Tej Pal is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. Notices were issued to the parties. The parties have amicably settled the dispute. The workman has been taken back in service, by respondent No. 1 under the Principal employer, respondent No. 2. The statement of the parties have been reduced into writing to this effect. Thus no dispute survives for adjudication. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 3rd April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 465, dated 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/4/87-6Lab./3045.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s G. D. Industrial Engineer, 13/7 Mile Stone, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL. HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 155/1986

between

**SHRI UDAI BHAN, S/O SHRI RAM BAHADUR C/O GENERAL SECRETARY INTUC
JILA PARISHAD 1-H/119, N.I.T., FARIDABAD AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S G. D. INDUSTRIAL ENGINEER 13/7 MILE STONE, MATHURA
ROAD, FARIDABAD**

Present :

Shri C. L. Oberai A. R. for the workman.

Shri S. B. Modi A. R. for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between Shri Udai Bhan, workman and the management of M/s G. D. Industrial Engineers, 13/7 Mile Stone, Mathura Road, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the services of Shri Udai Bhan have been terminated or he has lost his lien on the job by absenting himself and to what relief is he entitled ?

2. Notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings.

3. Happily the parties have amicably settled the dispute. The workman has received Rs. 1,550-95, paise in full and final settlement of his claim and has relinquished his rights for reinstatement. The statement of the parties has been reduced into writing to this effect.

4. Hence no point survives for adjudication. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 1st April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 468, dated the 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/4/87-6Lab./3046.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Topaz Overseas Pvt. Ltd., 24-B, 4/5 Industrial Area, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 135 of 1986

between

SHRI BABU LAL, WORKMAN C/O BHARTIYA MAZDOOR SANGH VISHVKARMA
BHAWAN, NEELAM BATA ROAD, FARIDABAD AND THE MANAGE-
MENT OF M/S TOPAZ OVERSEAS PVT. LTD., 24-B, 4/5
INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD

Present :—

None.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between Shri Babu Lal, workman and the management of M/s Topaz Overseas Pvt. Ltd., 24-B, 4/5 Industrial Area, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Babu Lal, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. Notices were issued to the parties. Shri Gopa Messee, Authorised Representative appeared on behalf of the workman whereas Shri J. S. Siroha Authorised Representative for the Management appeared. On subsequent hearings, the workman did not appear. His authorised representative also absented. The *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman on 27th March, 1987 and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the Management for today viz. 6th April, 1987.

Today none has appeared on behalf of the management. The authorised representative for the management has also not put in appearance and as such *ex parte* proceedings are ordered against the management as well. It is thus apparent that both the parties have not come forward to pursue this reference. It appears that they are not interested in the award. Accordingly the reference is dismissed for non-prosecution by the workman. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 6th April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 463, dated the 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/4/87-6Lab./3047.--In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Topaz Overseas Pvt. Ltd., 24-B, 4/5 Industrial Area, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 127/1986

between

SHRI ACHHEY LAL, WORKMAN C/O BHARTIA MAZDOOR SANGH, VISHKARMA
BHAWAN, NEELAM BATA ROAD, FARIDABAD AND THE MANAGEMENT
OF M/S TOPAZ OVERSEAS PVT. LTD., 24-B, 4/5, INDUSTRIAL AREA,
FARIDABAD

Present.—

None.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Achhey Lal, workman and the management of M/s Topaz Overseas Pvt. Ltd., 24-B, 4/5, Industrial Area, Faridabad to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Achhey Lal is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. Notices were issued to the parties. Shri Gope Messee, authorised representative appeared on behalf of the workman whereas Shri J. S. Sarcha authorised representative for the management appeared. On subsequent hearings, the workman did not appear. His authorised representative also absented. The *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman on 27th March, 1987 and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the management for today viz 6th April, 1987. Today none has appeared on behalf of the management. The authorised representative for the management has also not put in appearance and as such *ex parte* proceedings are ordered against the management as well. It is thus apparent that both the parties have not come forward to pursue this reference. It appears that they are not interested in the award. Accordingly the reference is dismissed for non-prosecution by the workman. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 6th April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 464, dated the 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad

No. 9/4/87-6Lab/3048.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Contractor P. N. Seth M/s Hindustan Koke Wires Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 102/1986

between

SHRI DEVINDER SINGH, WORKMAN, S/O BHULE SINGH C/O MAZDOOR SEWAK SANGH,
RAJINDER FARM, LINK ROAD, FARIDABAD AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S
CONTRACTOR P. N. SETH, M/S HINDUSTAN KOKE WIRES LTD.,
MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri K. P. Aggarwal, Authorised Representative for the management.
None, for the workman.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Devinder Singh workman and the management of M/s Contractor P. N. Seth M/s Hindustan Koke Wires Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Devinder Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. Notices were issued to the parties. The case of petitioner is that he was appointed as Painter on 3rd May, 1985 on monthly wages of Rs. 600 with the respondent but the respondent chose to terminate his services illegally on 10th June, 1986. He challenged the order of termination of his services. He prays for reinstatement with all back wages.

3. The claim of the petitioner was controverted by the respondent-management.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled :—

(1) Whether the reference is bad in law? OPM.

(2) Whether the termination of services of Shri Devinder Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled? OPM

5. Subsequently Shri H. P. Singh Authorised Representative for the workman absented himself. The workman also did not put in appearance and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman. The management examined Shri P. N. Seth MW-1.

6. I have heard Shri K. P. Aggarwal, Authorised Representative of the management and gone through the record.

7. Shri K. P. Aggarwal has produced on record Ex. M-1 copy of settlement reached between the parties and Ex-2 receipt executed by the workman. The workman has not come forward to challenge its authenticity and as such I have no reasons to disbelieve it. From the perusal of the settlement Ex.M-1 and receipt Ex.M-2, it is clear that the dispute has amicably been settled between the parties. The workman has received Rs. 500 in full and final settlement of his claim and has relinquished his rights of reinstatement.

8. In view of the statement made by Shri K. P. Aggarwal authorised representative, no point survives for adjudication. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 27th April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 167, dated the 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four Copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/4/87-6Lab/3049.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Perfect Pack Ltd., Plot No. 134/24, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 94/1986

between

SHRI AMAR SINGH C/O SHYAM SUNDER GUPTA, 50, NEELAM CHOWK, FARIDABAD
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PERFECT PACK LTD., PLOT NO. 134/24,
FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri Amar Singh, workman in person with Shri Balbir Singh Authorised Representative.
Shri R. C. Sharma, Authorised Representative for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Amar Singh, workman and the management of M/s Perfect Pack Ltd., Plot No. 134/24, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication:—

Whether the services of Shri Amar Singh have been terminated or he has lost his lien on the job by absenting himself from duties and to what relief is he entitled ?

2. Notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their respective pleadings. The issues were settled. The management also produced its evidence and the case was fixed for evidence of the workman.

3. Happily the parties have reached an amicable settlement. The statement of Shri Amar Singh, workman and that Shri Balbir Singh Authorised Representative of the workman and Shri R. C. Sharma Authorised Representative for the management has been reduced into writing.

4. As per terms of settlement, the management has agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 3,000 in full and final settlement of his claim including reinstatement/re-employment. The workman does not want to proceed with this reference. The parties shall abide by the settlement. In view of the settlement between the parties, no point survives for adjudication. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 17th April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 462, dated the 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/4/87-6Lab/3050.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bony Rubber Company Pvt., Ltd., 9E, Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI S. B. AHUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 75/1986

between

SHRI MUMTAZ ALAM, SON OF SHRI FIDAHUSSAIN VILLAGE KHETRAHI, P.O. PATEPUR DISTRICT VAISHALI (BIHAR) AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BONY RUBBER COMPANY PVT. LTD., 9E, SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD

Present .—

Shri Mumtaz Alam, workman in person with S.C. Srivastva authorised representative.

Shri N. K. Kapoor, Personnel Officer with Shri J.S. Saroha, authorised representative for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Mumtaz Alam and the management of M/s Bony Rubber Company Pvt. Ltd., 9E, Sector 6, Faridabad, to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mumtaz Alam is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. Notices were issued to the parties. The parties have amicably settled the dispute. The workman has received Rs 6,550 in full and final settlement of his claim and relinquished his rights for reinstatement. The settlement of the parties have been recorded to this effect.

3. Hence no point survives for adjudication. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 2nd April, 1987.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 471, dated the 30th April, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. B. AHUJA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.